

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Request for Continued Examination:

The applicant respectfully requests continued examination of the above-indicated application as per 37 CFR 1.114.

5

### **1. Introduction**

This is a full and timely response supplemental response to the Office Action of May 29, 2009. Claims 1, 18, and 21 are amended and new claims 22-24 are introduced. All amendments are supported at least by paragraphs [0020]-[0025] and Figs.2 and 4-5. No new material has been introduced. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

10

### **2. Claim Objections**

*Claims 1-4, 6 -8 and 17 are objected to because of the following informalities:*  
*An Acronym, like BIOS in the claims above, needs to be spelled out once as their claimed intermediate meanings tend to change over time.*

15

Claim 1 is amended accordingly, as supported at least by paragraph [0004]. Reconsideration of these objections is respectfully requested.

20

### **3. Background**

*Claims 1-2, 7, and 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schieve (US 5,463,766) in view of Sanchez (US 6,477,666). Claims 3-4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schieve in view of Sanchez and in further view of Phillips (US 5321828). Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schieve in view of Sanchez and in further view of Robinson (US 5,768,591).*

25

### **4. Response**

Concerning the first point in the Examiner's response to arguments on page 2 of

30

the current Office action, claim 1 is amended to specifically include limitations of taking both the general processing path and the error processing path for the event. Furthermore, claim 21 is amended to depend upon claim 1 and includes the limitations of executing both paths for each of the plurality of events. The references fail to teach  
5 execution of both paths for a single event as specified in at least claim 1 and also fail to teach execution of both paths of every event as specified at least in claim 21, now dependent upon claim 1.

Concerning the final point in the Examiner's response to arguments on page 3 of the current Office action, claim 1 is also amended to specifically include limitations of  
10 the BIOS program code executing the events and therefore should not be "treated as executing by Schieve e.g. Fig.4, step 470". The same argument also applies to amended independent claim 18 and new claims 22-24.

It is again noted that it is impossible for Schieve to read on these limitations at least because Schieve requires fully functioning core components, such as a CPU and  
15 disk. Schieve states (Col.6, lines 31-43) that the disclosed method is practiced by loading images from a disk. If images are loaded from the disk to perform the disclosed method, at least the CPU, the memory, and the disk drive must all already be functioning properly and would not execute the error processing path.

## 20 **5. Summary**

Known references fail to teach executing both the error processing path and the general processing path of each event and therefore fail to meet every claim limitation. Schieve requires fully functioning core components, such as a CPU and disk and therefore would not execute the error processing path.

25 Additionally, known references fail to specifically teach of the BIOS program code executing the events as is claimed.

For at least these reasons, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of claims 1, 3-4, 6-8, 17-19, and 21 and consideration of new claims 22-24.

Sincerely yours,

/Winston Hsu/

Date: 07/14/2009

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

5 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

10 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)